

# Introduction–History

This introduction serves a two-fold purpose: (1) to review the history of school counseling as summarized in *The ASCA National Model: A Framework for School Counseling Programs* and (2) to review the history the Comprehensive Counseling and Guidance Program in Utah.

## History of School Counseling

(from *The ASCA National Model for School Counseling Programs*, 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition, used by permission)

School counselors continue to define new directions for their profession as they navigate through the educational landscape of the 21<sup>st</sup> century. The purpose of *The ASCA National Model: A Framework for School Counseling Programs* is to create one vision and one voice for school counseling programs. In understanding the school counseling profession's future, it is crucial to understand its past.

At the turn of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, school counselors did not exist. Instead, teachers used a few minutes of their time to offer vocational guidance to students preparing for work in a democratic society. The school mission of today is not altogether different than in the 1900s. Today, in a world enriched by diversity and technology, school counselors' chief mission is still supporting the academic achievement of all students so they are prepared for the ever-changing world of the 21<sup>st</sup> century. School counselors

do not work in isolation; instead, they are professionals, integral to the total educational program. This evolution from minutes a day to trained professionals implementing a school counseling program

is the result of professional scholars, counselor educators, administrators and school counselors having the vision, knowledge and determination to move forward (Hatch & Bowers, 2002).

School counseling training programs have conflicting and varied theoretical perspectives. Consequently, within the field we have programs that have trained counselors differently. School counselors began as vocational counselors nearly 100 years ago, and the profession has evolved to address all children in the comprehensive domains of academic, career and personal/social development.

During this evolution, differing philosophical perspectives developed between and among academic counselors, career counselors, and personal/social or mental health counselors regarding school counselors' role, function, purpose and focus.

***“Creating a new approach to counseling in Utah’s public schools through the Comprehensive Counseling and Guidance Model was the result of years of hard work and practice of our professional school counselors. It was their vision to provide each school with the most effective, responsive counseling program that reaches out to all of Utah’s students.”***

*– Tom Sachse,  
Secondary Comprehensive  
Counseling and Guidance*

In the late 1950s and early 1960s, the National Defense Education Act provided funds to train school counselors. Although some in the field advocated for a directive approach to school counseling, the training school counselors received was heavily influenced by the client-centered view often called the nondirective approach to counseling. Counselors trained in programs rooted in psychological and clinical paradigms differed greatly from those rooted in educational paradigms. These varying perspectives confused and caused role confusion among school counselors, school administrators, teachers, and parents or guardians. In an effort to unify the profession, comprehensive guidance and counseling programs emerged in the 1970s and 1980s (Gysbers & Henderson, 2000; Myrick, 2003).

Historical analyses of earlier program descriptors include “vocational counselor,” “guidance counselor” and “guidance and counseling.” However, in 1990, ASCA’s Governing Board unanimously moved to call the profession “school counseling” and the program a “school counseling program.” This change was later reflected in an ASCA statement of the school counselor’s role. In 1997, ASCA published “Sharing the Vision: The National Standards for School Counseling Programs” (Campbell & Dahir, 1997) as a conscious effort to participate in the national reform agenda through the development of the ASCA National Standards. This landmark document for the profession, endorsed by national educational and professional organizations, contains student content standards for school counseling programs in the areas of academic, career and personal/social development. “Vision Into Action: Implementing the National Standards for School Counseling Programs” (Dahir, Sheldon & Valiga, 1998) provides

***“ASCA has a long and valued history of helping counselors be more effective and efficient in their work.”***

*– Bob Myrick, Ph.D.,  
University of Florida*

school counselors with tools for selecting student competencies and suggestions for infusing competencies into the school counseling program. ASCA’s National Standards have been widely used in designing content standards for students in school counseling programs.

At its March 2001 meeting, ASCA’s Governing Board agreed that development of a national school counseling program model was the next logical step to build on the National Standards. ASCA held a meeting to create a National Model for School Counseling Programs and brought together leaders in the field to create the vision. ASCA moved forward in developing the model to address historical concerns, meet current challenges within the profession and assist counselor educators and practicing school counselors in planning for the future of their programs and the profession through one common lens.

*The ASCA National Model: A Framework for School Counseling Programs* maximizes the full potential of the National Standards documents and directly addresses current education reform efforts. This includes the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, which emphasizes increased accountability for all federally funded programs.

*The ASCA National Model: A Framework for School Counseling Programs* is written to reflect a comprehensive approach to program foundation, delivery, management and accountability. The ASCA National Model provides the mechanism with which school counselors and school counseling teams will design, coordinate, implement, manage and evaluate their programs for students’ success. It provides a framework for the program components, the school counselor’s role in implementation and the

underlying philosophies of leadership, advocacy and systemic change. School counselors switch their emphasis from service-centered for some of the students to program-centered for every student. It not only answers the question, “What do school counselors do?” but requires us to respond to the question, “How are students different as a result of what we do?”

ASCA collaborated to develop the model after extensive review and synthesis of state, district and site models, bringing together the most important current concepts regarding school counseling programs.

Although The ASCA National Model serves as a framework for the development of a school counseling program, it is not meant to be replicated exactly as it is written here.

Counselors who implement effective programs consider local demographic needs and political conditions when integrating and adapting The ASCA National Model; therefore, is not intended to be used as a cookie-cutter

approach in developing school counseling programs. Rather, ASCA’s goal is to institutionalize the framework for and process of developing a school counseling program.

In *The ASCA National Model: A Framework for School Counseling Programs*, the school counselor serves as the program leader. ASCA collaborated with The Education Trust to infuse themes of advocacy, leadership and systemic change throughout the document ([www.edtrust.org](http://www.edtrust.org)). The program defines the school counselor’s leadership role within the school counseling model. The school counselor’s leadership skills are important to the successful implementation of new or remodeled

programs at the school, district or state level. In this leadership role, school counselors serve as change agents, collaborators and advocates. School counselors must be proficient in retrieving school data, analyzing it to improve student success and using it to ensure educational equity for all students. Through collaboration with other professionals in the school building, school counselors influence systemic change and advocate for students and their counseling program by using strong communication, consultation and leadership skills.

The ASCA National Model incorporates school counseling content standards for every student, focusing the direction for an organized, planned, sequential and flexible school guidance curriculum. The ASCA

National Model recommends the use of disaggregated data to drive program and activity development, thus enabling school counselors to intentionally design interventions to meet the needs of all students and to close the gap between specific groups of students and their peers. The ASCA

National Model provides an organizational framework and accountability systems to determine how well students have met the standards or achieved intended outcomes. The school counseling program aligns goals and objectives with the school’s mission and ultimately leads to increased student achievement as demonstrated by results data.

The implementation of The ASCA National Model holds great promise for the school counseling profession and the students of this nation. In serving all students equitably, effective school counseling programs become data driven, and are annually evaluated and modified based on results. No matter how comfortable the status quo

***“This document is not a quick fix but rather a step-by-step pathway to a school counseling program you can be proud of and know you can implement.”***

*– Pat Schwallie-Giddis, Ph.D.,  
George Washington University*

or how difficult or uncomfortable change may be, it is necessary to ensure that every student achieve success. The ASCA National Model promises to direct us away

from inconsistent program implementation and expectations toward a united, focused professional school counseling program with one vision in mind.

In response to concerns regarding whether the National Standards documents are standards for programs or students, The ASCA National Model Task Force concurred at its November 2002 meeting that the ASCA National Standards (Campbell & Dahir, 1997; Dahir, Sheldon & Valiga, 1998) are content standards for student academic, career and personal/social development. The National Standards are for students, not programs.

Other standards are addressed within this document: ASCA program standards (for program audits), ASCA school counselor performance standards (for school counselor evaluation) and ASCA Ethical Standards.

### History of the Comprehensive Counseling and Guidance Program in Utah

(Summarized from the 1998 “History of the Comprehensive Counseling and Guidance Program in Utah,” written by R. Lynn Jensen and Judy Petersen)

During the 1980s, there was a growing concern with the counseling and guidance programs in Utah’s public secondary schools. Counselor numbers were not keeping pace with a burgeoning student population. During this time, counselor-to-student ratios rose from 1:430 to 1:550.

Program administrators in the Utah State Office of Education and leaders of the local vocational directors’ group believed dramatic measures were needed to restructure guidance in the state. They agreed to commit up to ten percent of federal, state, and local vocational education resources for school counseling support. However, tied to this commitment was a stipulation that school counseling be established as a full-fledged education program.

At that time Utah, along with several states such as Missouri, New Hampshire, Idaho,

Ohio, and Alaska, critically evaluated school counseling and guidance services and committed to implement a Comprehensive Counseling and Guidance Program.

The state leadership for counseling and guidance in Utah was aware of an ongoing effort in Missouri to systematically train counselors and implement the Comprehensive Counseling and Guidance Program (CCGP). A decision was made to develop an adaptation of that initiative as the “change agent” strategy for Utah. Several things were critical for an effective restructuring of the program:

- A new model had to be endorsed and supported by a broad-based group of education leaders in the state.
- Adequate time had to be devoted to the change process.
- The change had to be supported and facilitated by the key building administrator who was the principal.
- A full team of all of the school’s counselors and other key teachers and administrators had to participate in the change process.
- The change process had to be adequately funded to give the counselors planning and development time above and beyond their regular

“contract” days and to provide for the purchase of needed curriculum, materials, and equipment.

It was also believed that a small number of lead schools should be selected to initiate the process and that a supportive environment should exist at both the school and school district level in order to maximize the chances of successful program implementation in these lead schools.

By 1986 the Comprehensive Counseling and Guidance Model was widely embraced conceptually at the local and State Office of Education level. The Utah model focused on:

- Reaching 100 percent of the student population.
- Providing a programmatic approach to guidance.
- Ensuring accountability.
- Eliminating non-guidance activities such as clerical duties that could be done by non-certificated personnel, or quasi-administrative duties more appropriately assigned to other school personnel.
- Developing student competencies to address student needs.
- Defining the role of the school counselor within the Comprehensive Counseling and Guidance Program Model.

However, while many counselors spoke favorably of the model, systematic and full implementation failed to materialize in most schools. Then in 1989, amid growing dissatisfaction with counseling and guidance, a debate developed concerning the best approach to redirect and strengthen career guidance services in the schools. The subsequent conversion to a Comprehensive Counseling and Guidance approach happened through the following training schedule.

- 1989 – Training was provided to 11 pilot schools for the implementation of CCG Programs.
- 1990 – Another 12 schools joined in the three-year training commitment.
- 1992-93 – 12 of these 23 pilot schools received approval for fully implementing CCG Programs.
- 2003-04 – 251 of 257 target secondary schools received program approval.
- 2003-04 – Charter schools began training and implementation of CCG Programs.
- 2005-06 – Implemented in 242 of 259 target secondary schools.
- 2006-07 – Implemented in 262 schools.

The paradigm shift from “position” to program was not only consistent with the mission of education but also established rationale consistency throughout all of the components of the model. The model had a rationale and framework for ridding counselors of numerous non-guidance activities that occupied much of their time. It was evident that the model had the power to spur counselors into action. School counselor teams enthusiastically rose to the challenge of remodeling their program.

When funds were appropriated and then allocated to school districts on the basis of schools developing a guidance program that met CCGP standards, a final, powerful incentive was created to bring about a statewide adoption and implementation of the model.

Utah's Comprehensive Counseling and Guidance Program is unique in its statewide approach to implementation and its near-universal adoption by the middle/junior high schools and high schools of the state. For most school districts, CCGP funds have been effectively leveraged in keeping counselor-student ratios at workable levels. In 2007, the Utah Legislature suggested that schools receiving CCGP funds maintain a counselor-to-student ratio at 1:350 or



lower. In November 2008, the Utah State Board of Education passed a resolution proposing a 1:350 or lower required ratio.

Today the Comprehensive Counseling and Guidance Program has progressed significantly. For example:

- The average counselor-to-student ratio is now 1:397 at the secondary level.
- However, the average counselor-to-student ratio at the elementary level is 1:1,164
- The amount of time counselors spend working directly with students has held steady at 80 percent or greater.
- Career exploration resources (e.g., *Choices Planner* and *Choices Explorer*) are more available and accessible.
- Counselors are provided effective annual training in the Comprehensive Counseling and Guidance Program.
- Parent support and involvement in the Student Education Plan (SEP) and Student Education Occupation Plan (SEOP) process has increased.
- Student participation and student interest in the SEP/SEOP process has increased.

### Training

The Utah State Office of Education plays an integral role in the overall function of the Comprehensive Counseling and Guidance Program. The state CCGP specialist provides leadership for in-service and technical assistance to counselors, administrators, teachers, district- and state-level personnel and others. In addition, the state provides leadership and assistance in the development of materials and resources to assist schools and districts in strengthening individual components of the Utah model. In effect the state personnel have developed a statewide strategy for implementation of the model that individual schools and districts can easily follow.

The state CCGP specialist works with districts to identify schools that are ready for training in the Comprehensive Counseling and Guidance Program. Any public secondary school is eligible to participate; however, only public schools, including charter schools, which enroll students in grades 7 through 12 are eligible to receive state-legislated funding. Initially, the state-sponsored in-service training was held annually in August. Secondary school counseling and guidance teams that included counselors, administrators, and counseling program secretaries or clerks and career center personnel attended their appropriate level of training—a first-year, second-year, or third-year session. Schools were trained on the following:

- First-year schools were trained in the basic components of developing and managing a school guidance program and introduced to the Utah model.
- Second- and third-year schools reviewed Comprehensive Counseling and Guidance Program concepts and their past year's accomplishments, and then made plans to move on to a more focused training concentrating on the areas of program assessment and evaluation and any "Utah-specific" Comprehensive Counseling and Guidance Program issues.

Currently, every new secondary professional school counselor, new administrator or new secretary/clerk or career center staff member participates in a one-day Basic Training with an experienced member of the school counseling and guidance team. The goal of this training is to help these team members come to a common understanding of terminology, create a synergy between old and new learning, and provide team time for planning to move the Comprehensive Counseling and Guidance Program forward.

In addition, during June more than 700 professional school counselors, building administrators and district personnel participate in the annual Career and Technical Education Summer Conference: Comprehensive Counseling and Guidance Training. This training consists of a half-day of college articulation information for all school counselors, one day of break-out information sessions and one day of half-day skill-building sessions. The elementary guidance specialists (which may include school psychologists and school social workers) have been fully integrated into the two full days of CCGP training.

### Funding

So far, incentive funding has been available only for secondary CCG Programs. In part this is because the initial funds were made available through Perkins and Career and Technical Education (CTE) funding, which is restricted to secondary students. Currently, CTE provides incentive grants, based on school enrollments, to secondary schools that meet the rigorous standards of the CCGP Performance Review. These evaluations are performed by out-of-district, peer-to-peer evaluation teams, which encourage programs to connect to the mission of the local school and provide evidence of contributions to student achievement. Beginning with the 2002-03 school year, the funding process has included:

- An RFP from the local school district with assurances for monitoring program quality.
- Two annual data projects from each CCGP modeled after the ASCA Guidance Activities and Closing the Gap Action Plans and Results Reports.

The state CCGP specialist monitors the status of program implementation and makes recommendations to the Utah State

Board of Education for funding increases. The funding request proceeds through a rigorous prioritization process. After this process takes place, a recommendation is made by the Utah State Office of Education to the Utah State Legislature for additional program funds. This process requires looking at the funding formula and the total number of schools trained in Comprehensive Counseling and Guidance and anticipating their readiness for meeting program standards.

The formula used to calculate the funds secondary schools receive is based on the Weighted Pupil Unit (WPU) and school enrollment. The value of the WPU increases with inflation. The original funding formula was based on bands of enrollment: 1 – 399, 400 – 799, 800 – 1199, and greater than 1200.

In December 2003, the Utah State Board of Education approved restructuring of the funding formula for the Comprehensive Counseling and Guidance Program – a base equivalent to 6 WPU for enrollments up to 400 allocated to every Comprehensive Counseling and Guidance Program, plus a per-student stipend for enrollments beyond 400 prorated to the allocation, about \$32.00 per student, capping at 1,200 students. With the 2007 increase, schools receive an additional 1.5 WPU if they provide matching funds.

The impetus for the change in the funding formula came from smaller districts with decreasing enrollments; even ten fewer students enrolled at a school could result in a drop to a lower funding band and a loss of more than \$10,000 overnight. The new formula relies on the October 1 enrollment count from the previous year, which gives districts additional stability in planning for personnel, the primary use of the Comprehensive Counseling and Guidance Program funds.

In 2007, the Utah State Legislature approved an additional \$1,000,000 for the CCGP incentive grants with intent language that schools accepting CCGP funds need to commit to keep counselor-to-student ratios at 350:1 or lower. This increased funding will allow the base funding for each participating school to be increased to the equivalent of 7.5 WPU.

The challenge to find incentive funding to support the implementation of Comprehensive Counseling and Guidance Programs at the elementary level remains.

### Program Success

A 1998 study of the Utah secondary Comprehensive Counseling and Guidance Program sought to answer this question: “What impact does the level of implementation of the Comprehensive Counseling and Guidance Program have on important descriptors of student success and other characteristics?”

An overall analysis of the information presented in the study suggests a pattern of meaningful and statistically significant differences between high and low implementing schools.

### Improvements in Student Achievement

- *Students in high implementing schools took more advanced mathematics and science courses.*
- *Students in high implementing schools took more technical courses.*
- *Students in high implementing schools had higher ACT scores in every area of the test.*

### Other Important Indicators

- *Students in high implementing schools rated their overall educational preparation as more adequate.*
- *Students in high implementing schools rated their job preparation as better.*

- *Fewer students in high implementing schools described their program as “general.”*
- *Students in high implementing schools rated guidance and career planning services in the schools higher.*

As evidenced by this study, Comprehensive Counseling and Guidance Programs affect important student outcomes and other characteristics that have a positive effect on each student.

Another study in 1999 evaluated the level of program implementation and pupil-counselor ratios within the secondary Comprehensive Counseling and Guidance Program. The study asked school counselors to indicate the accuracy of several statements describing various aspects of the Comprehensive Counseling and Guidance Program at their school.

The following are the major specific conclusions from the study:

- There is a statistically significant relationship between the pupil-counselor ratio and the level of Comprehensive Counseling and Guidance Program implementation in Utah secondary schools.
- Secondary schools that had the highest rates of implementation of Comprehensive Counseling and Guidance had pupil-counselor ratios below 400.
- Secondary schools that had the lowest rates of implementation of Comprehensive Counseling and Guidance had pupil-counselor ratios over 500.

***“You can’t choose what you don’t know.”***

– R. Lynn Jensen, Ed.D.  
Former Project Director  
Utah Career Resource Network



- Secondary schools with lower pupil-counselor ratios report that they can do a much more effective job of making Student Education Occupation Plans (SEOPs) a meaningful experience for students.
- Secondary schools with lower pupil-counselor ratios report that they can do a better job of providing individual assistance through responsive services to students.

The results from the study indicate strongly that a school's counselor-to-student ratio influences its ability to implement Comprehensive Counseling and Guidance at high levels and, thus, improve student performance. This strongly suggests that Utah public schools that have qualified for Comprehensive Counseling and Guidance funding more successfully implement the model and achieve positive results when the counselor-to-student ratio at their schools was near the recommended level of 400 students per counselor.

In 2005-06, the recommended counselor-to-student ratio was lowered to 1:350 to help counselors support the expectations of Performance Plus, the demands of No Child Left Behind (NCLB) and increasing responsibilities levied on each school counselor.

The most recent study of the Utah statewide Utah Comprehensive Counseling and Guidance program, completed in 2006, replicates the successes found by the 1998 study:

- Students in higher implementing schools take more high-level math, language arts and science classes.
- Students in higher implementing schools score better in every area of the ACT test.
- Students in both higher and lower implementing schools are less likely to describe their program of study as general, improving from the 1998

study levels at 49 percent and 58 percent, respectively to 38 percent and 46 percent respectively, for 2006.

### **Student Education Plan (SEP) and Student Education Occupation Plan (SEOP) – A Successful Feature**

Since 1972, the Utah State Office of Education has had a policy requiring secondary schools to assist every student in preparing an individual education plan – a Student Education Plan (SEP). In 1984, the Utah Legislature mandated an SEP or SEOP for every student. In 2002, the Utah legislature removed the mandate for individual SEPs and SEOPs, placing the responsibility on the local district to develop “effective plans for implementation.” Since then the SEP and SEOP process has been strengthened by increased support at the local level.

The SEP/SEOP, along with standards for career development and exploration, comprises the individual planning component of the Utah model. The SEP/SEOP process helps students through a coordinated sequence of steps that enables them to:

- Explore possibilities.
- Expand opportunities.
- Plan for education and career goals.
- Review progress toward achieving those goals.
- Access personalized solutions to improve learning.
- Make connections between work in school, post-secondary training, and the world of work.

The SEP/SEOP is a primary strategy for recognizing student accomplishments and strengths, and for planning, monitoring, and managing education and career development in grades K-12. This is achieved through an ongoing partnership involving students, parents, school

counselors, and other school personnel, the original secondary SEOP incorporated student information and competencies in the following areas:

- Self-Knowledge
- Educational and Occupation Exploration
- Career and Life Planning

These areas assist students in establishing educational and personal/life goals, and connect students to activities that will help them achieve their goals. The successful SEP or SEOP process is a cooperative effort of the student, the student's parent(s) or guardian(s), and a counselor or other educator to plan, monitor, and manage student education and career development.

The SEP or SEOP is directed by student education needs and requirements, however, the planning process also includes information on the student's interests, talents, achievements, and goals. This information is reviewed in an SEP or SEOP conference with the student, the student's parent(s) or guardian(s), and a counselor or other key educator at least once yearly. In a best practices scenario, the SEP or SEOP is directed by the student, enabling him or her to take charge, in a developmentally appropriate way, of his or her own education and planning.

The Comprehensive Counseling and Guidance Program has been the means for implementing SEP/SEOP implementation and improvement which was originally mandated by the Utah State Legislature. With strong emphasis on individual students' planning, schools have created impressive formats for documenting student goals, plans, and progress. Schools have also recognized the importance of parental involvement in the SEP/SEOP process. The Comprehensive Counseling and Guidance Program has been recognized by Utah's Parent Teacher Association as the driving

force behind meaningful SEP/SEOP development for every student.

### Other Successful Features

A strong, successful feature of the Utah model is the peer review evaluation process based on statewide program-approval standards. The peer review process provides opportunities for district and school administrators and counselors to leave their local areas and/or regions of assignment to review schools for Comprehensive Counseling and Guidance Program approval. This process facilitates an opportunity for training and networking among educators and ultimately strengthens the program implementation process.

Local schools and districts have taken the leadership role in developing materials, resources, and technology to support the model. For example, Davis District has developed an electronic SEP/SEOP as part of their district-wide strategic plan.

The original on-site review process required an out-of-district evaluation every three years. During the 2003-04 school year, the formal on-site review was changed to a six-year schedule, with local districts facilitating an interim three-year review focused on sharing of CCGP data projects: Guidance Activities and Closing the Gap Action Plans and Results Reports.

### Advice to New Implementers

While the Comprehensive Counseling and Guidance Program Model is certainly of value to an individual counselor, it is most effective when implemented as a school, or better still, as a district program. The strongest programs are in those schools that receive strong and consistent support from the district. For this reason, a school that is considering adopting the model should elicit a commitment from the principal to be involved in the training and implementation process. It is critical for the

building administrator to understand the conceptual framework of the model, the language of the model and the desired outcomes. In short, the principal must become a full stockholder in the new program.

Counselors in the school and, if possible, some key teachers and administrators should participate as members of the implementation “team” and members of the “steering” and “advisory” committees. The proper formation and use of the steering and advisory committees has proven to be extremely beneficial to schools as they move to adopt the model. The supportive voice and action of key opinion formers in the school and in the community have often proven to be invaluable in establishing advocacy for the program.

There are three important areas to implement in order to achieve success in the Comprehensive Counseling and Guidance Program. They are:

1. Counselors should be willing to participate in the basic training for the model two or three times and periodically review implementation efforts against the model. The CCGP model represents such a fundamental shift in thinking that it takes both time and repetition for all of the pieces to fit together or to have full meaning.
2. Implementers of the CCGP model should make provisions for the program implementation team to plan and develop its program. Time must be spent away from the demands of team members’ daily routine. For example, four to six days before school starts, and then two to four days intermittently allocated during the year, provides the

minimal amount of time needed to plan and develop the program.

3. Counselors should be patient and continue to make incremental improvements in their program. Three to five years are needed to make the transition to the Comprehensive Counseling and Guidance Program. School counselors have a professional responsibility to constantly seek for an incremental improvement of the program. No school counselor should be satisfied if the CCGP at his or her school is not better this year than it was last year.

Many say they have never worked harder in their lives. They also say they have never been more satisfied in their professional roles. There has been an almost universal expression of an enhanced professional image and sense of professional pride and increased opportunity to productively affect students’ lives. The

professional school counselor’s view of the worth of the program is mirrored in the expressions of administrators, school board members, the PTA organization, the Governor’s office, and many current and past state legislators.

***“The Utah Model provides our professional organization structure to assist school counselors in meeting the developmental needs of all students in the state of Utah.”***

– Kathy Bitner,  
USCA President 2007-2008  
Counselor, Alpine School District

### Summary and Future Goals

The 1996 Utah state Public Education Strategic Plan envisioned a system that personalized education for each student, with 100 percent of Utah’s students achieving the objectives of their individually developed Student Education Plan (SEP) or Student Education Occupation Plan (SEOP). Such lofty goals posed a tremendous challenge for school counselors, who are in a key position to influence student decision making and

planning. To meet this challenge, professional school counselors in Utah successfully moved from traditional ancillary counselor services to a school-wide Comprehensive Counseling and Guidance Program.

Building on the 1996 strategic plan and using the Utah Comprehensive Counseling and Guidance Program as a model, school counseling has become recognized as a critical component of the educational system. Administrators, counselors, teachers, parents, local and state board members and some legislators recognize guidance and counseling as a vital component of every student's education.

CCGP maintains the following goals as it continues to provide effective counseling and guidance to students throughout Utah:

- Continue to support the implementation and expansion of CCGP at the elementary level, including finding sources for incentive funding.
- Impact all students in a powerful and effective way as to the importance of decision making and planning for life's next steps.
- Encourage and assist each student in developing a Student Education Plan (SEP) or Student Education Occupation Plan (SEOP).
- Direct the counseling and guidance program to provide opportunities for student growth in the areas of Academic/Learning Development, Life/Career Development, Multicultural/Global Citizen Development, and Personal/Social Development.
- Involve the school (students and staff), the home (entire family), and the community (neighborhood and workforce) in implementing a Comprehensive Counseling and Guidance Program.

\*Beginning in 1989, the school counseling program in Utah was commonly referred to the Comprehensive Guidance Program or CGP. In the 2005-06 school-year, through feedback from the elementary, middle-school/junior high school and high school steering committees, the name was changed to Comprehensive Counseling and Guidance Program or CCGP. For consistency, Comprehensive Counseling and Guidance (CCG or CCGP) has been used throughout this section.

***“We need to be the change we want to see happen. We are the leaders we have been waiting for.”***

– Mahatma Gandhi